

REMARKS

The office action mailed March 12, 2004 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1 - 7 are amended to provide clarity.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph for failing to provide antecedent basis. Claim 1 is amended to correct antecedence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 - 5, and 8 - 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Comer US Patent 6,201,927.

Applicants' claim 1 trick mode method recites creating and storing a GOP history during a normal playback mode. During a trick mode playback the GOP history is used to edit the data stream for decoding and trick mode display.

Although Comer is directed to reproduction in trick play modes, Comer teaches memory usage where in first mode decoded frames are stored and in a second, trick play mode, decoded fields are stored. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion Comer fails to provide any teaching or suggestion of applicants' claim 1 method step reciting,

"...creating a group of picture structure history during normal decoding..."

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion Comer fails to mention or suggest storing a GOP history during decoding for normal playback.

In addition, the Examiner cites Figure 1A of Comer, which is disclosed as an MPEG group of pictures and not a "group of picture structure history" as the Examiner asserts. Furthermore, the Examiner cites Figure 1B and column 2, lines 26 - 27 of Comer, as anticipating applicants' method steps "creating a group of picture structure history and storing it into a GOP logger". However, Comer discloses Figure 1B as a reverse replay sequence and the Examiner's column 2 cite makes no mention nor suggestion of applicants' recited method steps.

Thus, since Comer provides no disclosure capable of performing applicants' recited method steps, Comer cannot anticipate or render obvious the method of

applicants' claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 - 7 depend from claim 1 and are, for the same reasons, not anticipated or rendered obvious.

In claim 8 applicants recite an apparatus for reproducing a digital data stream for trick mode display. The apparatus comprises a decoder for decoding the incoming digital data stream in normal play mode and an extraction means for creating a GOP history during normal decoding. A memory stores the GOP history for use by an editor which edits the digital data stream during trick mode playback. A decoder decodes the edited data stream and outputs pictures for display.

As discussed for claim 1, although Comer discloses trick play operation, Comer teaches memory usage which is different between normal play and trick play modes. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Comer fails to provide any teaching or suggestion of applicants' recited claim 8 extraction means,

“...for creating a group of picture structure history during normal decoding...”.

Furthermore, Comer provides no teaching nor suggestion of applicants

“...memory coupled to said extraction means for storing said history...”.

Since Comer fails to disclose or suggest structure as applicants' recite, claim 8 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 - 17 depend from claim 8 and are, for the same reasons, not anticipated or rendered obvious.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6 - 7, and 13 - 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McLaren in view of Comer.

McLaren's teachings are directed to the derivation of speed specific trick play bit streams in a non-real time recording situation. The multiple speed specific trick play bit streams facilitate subsequent trick play reproduction. The Examiner cites Figure 6, block 600 of McLaren which discloses user selection between the multiple

Serial No. 09/508,804

-8-

RCA90092

speed specific trick play bit streams. Specifically McLaren makes no mention nor suggestion as the Examiner asserts of,

“...requesting content of a group of picture history...”.

In addition, since McLaren teaches the simultaneous availability of multiple speed specific trick play bit streams, McLaren has no need nor requirement for, and makes no suggestion as asserted by the Examiner of,

“...enabling bit stream editing for trick mode application...”.

The Examiner's suggested obvious combination of McLaren and Comer is believed inoperable because McLaren teaches the provision of a number of predetermined trick play, speed specific bit streams, thereby obviating any need for real-time “editing” from a single bit stream. Furthermore the Examiner's combination lacks applicants' recited GOP history storage and recovery method and means.

Since independent claims 1 and 8 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Comer and because combination of McLaren and Comer lacks all applicants' recited elements and is also believed inoperable, applicants' claims 6 - 7, and 13 - 14 are patentable over McLaren in view of Comer. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Differences have been explained between the cited references and applicants' recited invention, it is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Dirk ALDOLPH et al.

September 20, 2004

By:-

Francis A. Davenport

Francis A. Davenport
Reg. No. 36,316
Phone (609) 734-6805

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc. Suite 200
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton,
New Jersey 08543-5312